

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/604,278	07/08/2003	Hariklia Deligianni	FIS920030061	1277
32074	7590 08/23/2005		EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION			ROJAS, BERNARD	
DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-48	32		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533			2832	. ,
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/604,278	DELIGIANNI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bernard Rojas	2832				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the country of the country	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	<u>ıne 2005</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.					
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application only documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	<b></b>					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by James et al. [US Pat. #5,479,042].

Claims 1 and 10, James et al. discloses a micro-electromechanical system (MEMS) switch comprising: a movable beam within a cavity, said movable beam being anchored to a wall of said cavity; [figures 2 and 3] a first signal electrode [32] on said movable beam; and a second actuation electrode [44] in a wall of said cavity, facing said first electrode, wherein said first and second electrodes are receptively capped by a metallic contact

[col. 5 lines 32-37 and 45-50].

Claim 2, James et al. discloses that the metallic contact of said first and second electrodes respectively protrude above said first electrode and below said second electrode [figure 2].

Claim 3, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation of the metallic cap being "made of planarized blanket deposition of noble material" has not been given patentable

weight. Furthermore, there is no positive structure recitation cited to support the claimed element "made of planarized blanket deposition of noble material". James et al. discloses that said first and second electrodes are receptively capped by a metallic contact [col. 5 lines 32-37 and 45-50].

Claim 4, James et al. discloses that the metallic contact is made of gold [col. 3 lines 5-12].

Claim 5, James et al. discloses that the movable beam is anchored to the wall of said cavity at at least one end thereof [figures 2 and 3].

Claims 6 and 12, James et al. discloses that the metallic contact is made from of Ruthenium (Ru) [col. 5 lines 32-37 and 45-50].

Claim 9, James et al. discloses that dielectric is made of SiO2 [col. 3 lines 1-5].

Claim 13, James et al. discloses that the exposed surface of said actuation electrode is recessed below an exposed surface of said dielectric, and said cap superimposed on top of said actuation electrode matches the exposed surface of said dielectric [figure 1].

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Application/Control Number: 10/604,278

Art Unit: 2832

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. [US Pat. #5,479,042].

Claim 4 and 11, James et al. discloses the claimed invention except for making the electrode of copper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use copper for the electrodes since it a well known electrical conductor commonly used for making electrodes and contacts.

Claim 8, James et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed size of the contacts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the size of the contacts in order to change the amount of contact latching (sticking) that occurs during the switching operation.

Art Unit: 2832

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernard Rojas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:00), every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin G. Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/604,278

Art Unit: 2832

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SPE-AU2832 02/18/0J

Page 6